

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/777,225	02/13/2004	Laura Maria Zanibelli	248903US0XCONT	2498	
22850 7	22850 7590 04/08/2005			EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			NGUYEN, TAM M		
	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1764		
			DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			. K
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/777,225	ZANIBELLI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a re ly within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 F	ebruary 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	• •	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 and 27 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 and 27 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
	epted or b) objected to b		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	,		
,	varianci. Note the attached	Office Action of formal 10-102.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document	s have been received. Is have been received in Ap nity documents have been i	oplication No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not r	received.	
Attachment(s)	, –	(222 (42)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/12/04; 	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/777,225

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart (3,156,640) in view of Bellussi et al. (EP-340868).

Application/Control Number: 10/777,225 Page 3

Art Unit: 1764

Hart discloses a process for the simultaneous isomerization of olefins and hydrodesulfurization of a hydrocarbon feed mixture which has a boiling point (0 to 250° C) within the gasoline range or naphtha range by contacting the feed mixture with catalyst comprising a metal from group VI (e.g., Mo), a metal from VIII (e.g., Co), and a silica-alumina carrier comprising at least 60 wt. % of silica wherein the total metals on the catalyst is in the range of from 0.5 to 15 wt. %. Hart also discloses that the sulfur content of the sulfur-containing hydrocarbon oil fraction is in the range of from 0.05 to 0.15 wt. %. (See entire patent)

Hart does not specifically disclose that the catalyst has physical characteristics as claimed. However, Bellussi discloses a composition of a catalyst which has the same physical characteristics as the claimed catalyst (see page 1 through page 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Hart by using a catalyst which has physical characteristics as taught by Bellussi because such a catalyst is effective in a process of isomerization of olefins.

Since the modified process of Hart is essentially similar to the claimed process, it would be expected that the modified process of Hart would have the HYD/ISO ratio as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/777,225 Page 4

Art Unit: 1764

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam M. Nguyen Examiner

Art Unit 1764

TN

4/1/05